

Remarks

This is in response to the first Office Action mailed June 21, 2004. The Applicant has hereinabove provided amendments to the title of the application and to the claims.

The title of the application has been amended to now recite "HIGH BANDWIDTH LARGE STROKE SPIN-STAND," in order to better conform the title to the claimed subject matter.

The claim amendments including modifications of the language of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 17, and 19, the cancellation without prejudice of claims 4, 10, 12-16, 18 and 20-24, and the addition of new claims 25-32. The claims have generally been amended to remove limitations deemed unnecessary for patentability and to better set forth the subject matter regarded as the invention. Amendments have further been entered to correct minor typographical errors in the claims as originally filed.

These amendments are believed to be proper, do not introduce new matter, and serve to place the application in proper condition for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

The first Office Action provided minor objections to the language of claims 5, 16-19 as a result of various typographical errors provided therein. The Applicant has amended these claims as discussed hereinabove, and it is believed that the objections are obviated by these amendments. The Applicant apologizes for any inconvenience caused by these errors.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The first Office Action rejected claims 1, 5, 16, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,683,744 issued to Takano et al. (“Takano ‘744”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,815 issued to Greene (“Greene ‘815”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that neither Takano ‘744, Greene ‘815, or the other art of record teach or suggest a spin-stand that includes a control circuit which translates the angular position from the encoder to a radial position of the head with respect to the medium, as now recited by claim 1. The Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, as well as for the rejection of the claims depending therefrom.

The Applicant further submits that the cancellation of dependent claim 16 obviates the rejection of this claim, and that dependent claims 17 and 19 are allowable based on the allowability of base claim 11, as discussed below.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The first Office Action further rejected claims 11-15, 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takano ‘744. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Takano ‘744, as well as the other art of record, fail to disclose a method including a step of bypassing adjustment of control current to a motor coupled to the actuator arm in accordance with the transduced servo data if said servo data are not consistent with the detected angular position of the actuator arm, as now set forth by amended claim 11.

Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11, as well as for the claims depending therefrom.

The Applicant further notes that rejected claims 20-23 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejection thereof.

New Claims 25-32

As discussed above, new claims 25-32 have been added, with claims 25-28 constituting additional dependent claims to independent claim 11 which is believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed above.

New independent claim 29 is an independent apparatus claim generally directed to a spin-stand that includes a Halbach array voice coil motor used to move a rotary actuator arm, as described therein. The Applicant believes this is patentable over the prior art, as indicated by the indication of allowability of original claim 2. New dependent claims 30-32 are also believed to be patentable as depending from a patentable base claim. Favorable action upon these new claims is respectfully solicited.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The first Office Action indicated that claims 2-4, 6-10, 18 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. The Applicant gratefully acknowledges this indication of allowability by the Examiner. It is believed that all of the claims in the application are now in proper condition for allowance.

Conclusion

This is intended to be a complete response to the first Office Action mailed June 21, 2004. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the claims therein.

Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below signed attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,197
Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659
Customer No. 33900